

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 860

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 860, the Social Security 2100 Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House expects to meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week will be expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2513, the Corporate Transparency Act. This bill is part of a package of legislation coming to the floor to crack down on money laundering and shine a light on the corrosive impact of dark money from Russia and other authoritarian governments on our democracy, a serious national security threat that must be addressed.

Lastly, the House will consider H.R. 4617, Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy, otherwise known as the SHIELD Act. Clearly, we believe that it is extraordinarily dangerous to be having foreign governments, particularly those who are hostile to the interests of democracy and the United States, to be participating in any financial way or any other way in our elections. This bill will prevent foreign interference in our elections and safeguard our democracy.

There also may be additional items that are possible to be brought forward, and we will notify the House and the minority as soon as we have made such decisions.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know we all continue to mourn the loss of our colleague, Elijah Cummings. We still see the flowers sitting in the spot where Elijah used to sit.

Yesterday, I thought we had a very appropriate remembrance of our col-

league in a special way, remembering who he was, the special person he was, the giant that he was, the leader—sometimes in a very boisterous way, sometimes in a gentle way.

But Maya, his wife, and his three children are in our prayers, and will continue to be as we remember that great loss that we experienced and will continue to remember.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I was going to mention Elijah at the end of our colloquy, but it was an extraordinarily sad day to hear of the loss yesterday, in the very early morning, of a colleague who was gentle, decent, honest, of high intellect, and high integrity.

The minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, spoke beautifully, I thought, about sentiments from both sides of the aisle, about Elijah Cummings. He was respected as a man, not only of intellect, but of great civility and kindness. And, yes, he could be tough. He was tough. He was the son of sharecroppers and became a Member of the Congress of the United States.

What a wonderful American story, and what a wonderful, decent, good human being Elijah Cummings was. And he will be remembered as such.

I thank the minority leader and I thank the minority, so many Members, who have served with Elijah on the minority, and, obviously, on a committee as the minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, pointed out, it can be pretty contentious from time to time.

But notwithstanding, Trey Gowdy and others who had served with him, served as either ranking member or chairman, spoke so highly of him. He was a very dear friend of mine for over four decades. He was the first African American speaker pro tem of the Maryland House of Delegates; president of the student government at Howard University, Phi Beta Kappa; and served with such distinction for 23 years in this House, and we will miss him. I thank the Republican whip for mentioning his passing, and how sad all of us are at that passing.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we all remember him, it is that style. It shows the example for all of us that you can be tough, you can fight for the things you believe in—we ought to all come here to fight for the things we believe in—and that means we are not always going to agree.

But he always treated people fairly, and the fact that even as he had some of those tough confrontations with people like Chairman Gowdy and JIM JORDAN, that those people who went toe to toe with him respected him, and mourn his loss equally as we all do, I think it says a lot about his character and that he is able to leave a strong legacy as a champion for the things he believed in. But even his adversaries that he fought with on the other side hold deep regard for the kind of person he was. Again, he was a great example for all of us to,

hopefully, try to emulate as we move forward with some of the other challenges that we are facing.

I do want to ask the gentleman about the latest efforts to try to get some kind of fair process in where we are with this impeachment inquiry. There are hearings going on behind closed doors. Many of my colleagues have tried to attend some of those hearings and have been turned away if they are not on the committees of jurisdiction. Colleagues that have tried to go and read things like the Volker testimony have been turned away, denied the ability to do that.

So there is a real concern that there is an attempt to impeach a President of the United States, remove a President who is duly elected, using a process of secrecy, behind closed doors, where one person is setting the rules, breaking with the tradition that we have always had with the only three other times in our country's history where an impeachment inquiry began in the House.

In all of those cases, they laid out rules of fairness, where people were able to ask questions on both sides. People were able to call witnesses on both sides. Even the President would be able to have an opportunity to have somebody there to also question people. That has always been the case, and, yet, it is not the case here.

Very serious questions of fairness have been raised, and I would ask the gentleman: Are we going to finally get beyond this secret, closed-door, Star Chamber process of impeachment and go to something that is ruled in fairness? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I reject wholly and fully the premise underlying the whip's representation. There is no unfairness in this process.

The Republicans are like the lawyer who does not have the facts, because if he has the facts, he pounds on the facts; or if he has the law on his side, he pounds on the law. But if he neither has facts nor the law on his side, he pounds on the table, Madam Speaker. He makes noise.

The Republicans talk about process, not the substance. And the process, quite interestingly enough, is much of what the Republicans put in the rules that we included in our rules when we adopted them.

And as the whip clearly knows, one of the strongest advocates and defenders of the President of the United States sits there in the hearing, asks questions, can review documents, and could go right back to the White House and to all of your Members and say: This is what happened.

There is no unfairness in this, and no requirement that we have a vote. The committee is doing its job of fact-finding. Frankly, the White House counsel wrote a letter filled with eight pages that clearly misconstrues the status of this process; treats it as if it were the